

Student Preference Online Versus Traditional Courses

Louis C. Glover, EdD

Assistant Professor of Education
University of Tennessee at Martin
Martin, TN

Veronica Evans Lewis, PhD

Professor of Psychology
University of Louisiana at Monroe
Monroe, LA

Abstract

Practitioners, proponents, and opponents of online education are currently disseminating much information about online research. Although previous researchers indicate that most faculty members have embraced online learning, not all academicians agree with this assertion. This study explored preferences of 152 college student participants for taking online versus traditional face-to-face courses and sought to determine some reasons for their preferences. Results indicate that: students who have already taken a good number of online courses tend to prefer online courses and desire more online offerings from their institutions; online courses are not deemed appropriate for all students or subject areas; and, although online course quality remains questionable, online courses are considered either more difficult or equivalent in difficulty to face-to-face courses.

Online education, a type of distance learning that generally refers to any course of study that is accomplished exclusively via the Internet (Curran, 2008), has increased significantly in recent years (Allen & Seaman, 2007; Palloff & Pratt, 2001). Many students have earned advanced degrees in locations that were Internet accessible (Karber, 2003; Lyons, 2004). The majority of 2- and 4-year colleges now offer online courses (Waits & Lewis, 2003). One is hard pressed to find many post-secondary institutions that do not utilize online delivery for some of their course instruction. However, Allen and Seaman (2006) indicated that large public educational institutions were more likely to offer online education than were small private institutions. According to Farkas (2011), students enrolled in one or more online courses now account for 29% of the 19.34 million full and part-time students enrolled in degree granting universities in the United States. More than 6.1 million students took at least one online class during fall 2010 (Lytle, 2011). According to Reynold (2012), an additional 3.15 million of higher education students are now taking at least one course over the Internet. Lytle (2011) further stated that online education has become an integral part of many colleges and universities, with 65.6% of all chief academic officers reporting that online education is critical to the long-term strategy of an institution. Common reasons colleges cite for offering online courses are to meet student demand, provide access to those who cannot get to campuses, make more courses available, and increase enrollment (Farkas, 2011).

The concept of online classes previously invoked images of institutions that maintained no specific campuses or home bases that were often sneered at or considered diploma mills (Federal Trade Commission, 2006) by academicians, potential employers, or potential students (Buck, 2001). Often, potential employers would not consider degrees from such institution to be valid, especially advanced degrees (Adams & DeFleur, 2006). Today, that image is very

different. Thanks to widely accessible Internet connection, many students choose to use the Internet to pursue post-secondary educational opportunities. Some potential students who have been out of education for extended periods worry that an online degree is not as favorably regarded as those obtained at traditional brick and mortar institutions (Should you pursue an online degree, 2007). This is no longer the case. Online degree programs are now perceived by some experienced academicians to be just as effective and relevant as are those offered by traditional institutions of higher education (Ulmer, Watson, & Derby, 2007). Methods for offering practitioner courses and course activities, previously thought to be incompatible with online instruction, also currently are being explored (Menon & Rubin, 2011).

Advantages to taking online courses as opposed to face-to-face courses vary. Web-based learning provides students the freedom to learn practically anytime and from any place (Angiello, 2010; Coyner & McCann, 2004), whereas face-to-face courses involve learning situations where both instructor and student are in the same physical structure (Jain, Jain, & Jain, 2011). Unlike a traditional classroom, students taking online courses can participate in a class, complete assignments, listen to lectures, and submit their project work at their convenience without being restricted to very narrow time and space constraints (Reynold, 2012). Online education tends to be popular among students with jobs and families. Many online programs permit students to complete coursework entirely at their own pace or give them additional time above and sometimes beyond the normal school term (Pros and cons of online education, 2011).

Students enrolled in online courses tend to be older, undergraduates (Allen & Seaman, 2006), employed, have family obligations (Lyons, 2004) or time restrictions, or are limited by location relative to face-to-face courses (Deal III, 2002). For some students, participating in

Web-based courses is perceived as less daunting than being in a traditional brick and mortar classroom (Deal III, 2002). Anonymity provides an equal opportunity undisturbed by preconception that is caused by seating arrangement, age, race and gender. Students are able to think longer about what they wish to say (Coleman, 2005). In a comparison of student performance by course type, students in face-to-face courses have been shown to perform better than students in online courses, whereas online students expressed greater course satisfaction, motivation, and academic autonomy (Fillion, Limayem, Laferriere, & Mantha, 2009)

Online education enables student focused teaching approaches, such as discussion boards, that increase student interaction and the variety of opinions expressed while also reducing course domination by the most vocal students (Coleman, 2005). Harrington and Loffredo (2010) revealed that a statistically significant majority of introverts preferred online classes, whereas extraverts preferred face-to-face classes. Participants in the Harrington and Loffredo study who preferred face-to-face classes reported they were influenced by the class structure appealing to their need to learn through listening and by their desire to better gauge the emotional reactions of others in the class.

Koons (2012) suggested that some students enroll in online classes because they simply live too far away from a campus or that they do not see the point in driving to a campus when classes can be taken from their laptop or smartphone. Karber (2003) and Deal III (2002) indicated that some distance learners simply do not have time to attend traditional classes due to the fact that they are working parents who are limited by available free time. Koons (2012) indicated that this student might not have the time to spare for college. However, because their next promotion usually depends on a college education, most of these individuals attend classes online.

Because there are no geographic barriers to online learning, students can find diversity of course material that may not be available to them where they live or work. Online instructors often come with practical knowledge and may be located across the globe (Karber, 2003). Students often comment that online learning lets them attend class when fully awake and attend in increments of convenient time blocks, rather than in rigid 2- or 4-hour stretches once or twice a week (Coleman, 2005).

Many disadvantages to taking online courses also have been discussed in the literature. Jenkins (2011) indicated that success rates in online courses are only 50% as compared to 70-75% for comparable face-to-face classes. Therefore faculty members and administrators should evaluate whether every course be taught online and every student be allowed to take online courses. Bejerano (2008) suggested that online courses might be appropriate for courses that tap into low-level cognitive functions, but less appropriate for courses that require analysis and synthesis of data or the application and demonstration of acquired skills. Similarly, Jain et al. (2011) suggested that student interactivity in online courses differed as a function of course discipline.

Lee (2009) indicated that certain cultural groups might be particularly disadvantaged in the text-based world of distance education. According to Lee, Hispanics, African Americans, and to a lesser degree, Asians are generally much less comfortable with online courses than European Americans. Experienced instructors are aware that individuals possess different learning styles and often design course instruction to accommodate the different learning needs of their students (Gallagher-Lepak, Reilly, & Killion, 2009). Lee determined that; 20% of learners acquire information predominately through visual/verbal means, 30% of learners acquire

information predominately through auditory means, and 30% of learners acquire information predominately through kinesthetic means. Meeting the instructional needs of visual/verbal and auditory learners is readily addressed in both online and traditional classroom settings.

However, Lee pointed out that kinesthetic learners are the most challenging students to reach both via distance education and in live classroom situations.

Working class students tend to prefer (Kurth, 2012) and older students bring life experiences that significantly contribute to (Dykman & Davis, 2008) collaborative learning. Students in online classes tend to be separated by time and space, which minimizes opportunities for peer collaboration, which Tinto (1975) identified as a key indicator of student success. Although groups can be established that allow for individuals to complete collaborative products or converse online, some students have indicated a lack of value associated with such collaborations (Ellis, Ginns, & Piggott, 2009).

Brown (2011) reported that community college students enrolled in online courses fail and drop out more often than those whose coursework is classroom based. Brown indicated that, although students who enrolled in online courses tended to have stronger academic preparation and come from higher income brackets than the community college population on the whole, students who took online classes early in their college careers were more likely drop out than those who took only face-to-face courses.

The responsibility that comes with online courses can be challenging for some students to handle. The assumption is sometimes made that this generation is technologically sophisticated, but that is not necessarily true (Muilenburg & Berge, 2005). This assumption may especially be inaccurate in the community college population, which tends to include mostly low income, disadvantaged, and older students (Brown, 2011). Some first-year college students find it

difficult taking online courses due to lack of motivation or self-discipline (Taylor, 2003). Also, some students are not computer literate and some do not have personal computers (Davis, 2011).

Some online instructors question who is actually completing their course (Deal III, 2002; Dykman & Davis, 2008) and require students to complete more work than they would in face-to-face instruction to make up for the lack of in person interaction. They often require students to complete more discussion board postings, more paper submissions, more coursework, and lengthy readings (Jock, 2012). However, Dykman and Davis (2009) suggested that these increased graded activities in online courses must also be perceived by students as being fair and objective.

Online courses require student self-discipline (Allen & Seaman, 2006) and no small amount of academic ability and technical competence (Jenkins, 2011). Jenkins indicated that some software companies now market products designed to determine up front, whether students can handle the workload, the pedagogical approach, and the technical demands of the online environment. Unfortunately, not many schools pre-screen online courses to determine which students have the best chance of success (Fertig, 2012).

Students at Los Angeles Southwest College are told that successful online students must be self-motivated, able to problem solve on her own and be able to manage time effectively (Are online classes for you, 2008). These students are reminded that the burden is on them complete assignments and participate in the course. They are further informed that the online learning environment is textually based, meaning that students will be required to read and write significant amounts for many courses. Results of a study conducted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison indicated that their students enrolled in online courses reported better

retention, improved ability to review for exams, and greater engagement during classes with lecture capture than when their courses were primarily text-based (Study: college students prefer classes with online learning, 2012).

Practitioners, proponents, and opponents of online education are currently disseminating much information about online research. Whereas many articles can be found that relate to the general topic of online education, empirical research being done on online education is not very abundant. A review of current literature seems to indicate that most students, when offered a choice, prefer taking courses online rather than in traditional settings (Coleman, 2005; Fillion et al., 2009; Harrington & Loffredo, 2010). Farkas (2011) stated that officials at colleges said most faculty members have embraced online learning, however not all academicians are praising the growth of online courses (Bejerano, 2008; Brown, 2011; Jain et al., 2012; Kurth, 2012). Jenkins (2011) indicated that colleges and universities are offering more online courses because they can provide online courses much more cheaply than traditional courses while charging roughly the same tuition for both types. Although many topics relating to online education have been explored individually with different populations from different geographic regions, no studies were located that examined a substantial combination of these topics within the same population of participants who have access to and many of whom have taken online classes. For this reason, the authors of this study questioned whether students actually prefer online course delivery versus traditional course delivery methods and sought to identify explanations for their choice.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore participant preferences for taking online versus traditional face-to-face courses and to determine some reasons for their preference. Colleges, universities, and other secondary institutions of higher learning can use the findings of this study

to make informed decisions about offering online courses, which will assist those institutions in better meeting the needs of their students.

Method

Participants

A total of 152 college students from three universities in the southeast participated in this research study. The majority of participants was female ($n = 106$, 69.7%), between 20 and 29 years of age ($n = 64$, 42.1%), and identified themselves as living in rural areas ($n = 62$, 40.3%). Most participants were full time undergraduate students working toward a degree ($n = 97$, 63.8%) and indicated that they worked between 1 and 39 hours per week ($n = 58$, 38.2%). Table 1 (see Appendix A) provides a more detailed summary of participants' demographic characteristics.

Instrument

A survey was developed for use in this study. In addition to the five demographic questions indicated above, nine additional questions were posed to participants in order to assess their preferences and opinions regarding online courses (see Appendix B for additional questions and response options used in the survey). Some questions in the survey were not used in the current study.

Procedure

After gaining Institutional Review Board approval, participation was solicited by course instructors using email and course management systems. Potential participants were directed to access the survey via [surveymonkey.com](https://www.surveymonkey.com). A consent statement was included in the initial correspondence and also was provided on the initial page of the survey. The consent statement

informed potential participants of the purpose of the study, their rights regarding participation, and their right to withdraw from participation without penalty. Participation in the study was voluntary, and no incentives were offered to participants for their completion of the survey. Personally identifying information was neither collected nor reported for participants.

The authors of this study had to assume that participants gave honest answers to all questions, only completed the survey once, and were either currently enrolled or had recently been enrolled in college. The consent statement also indicated that the survey should not be completed by anyone under the age of 18, and the authors had to assume that participants adhered to that requirement as well.

Results

Survey data were initially analyzed using descriptive statistics and Goodness of Fit Chi-Square. Results indicated that, although participants had taken an average of 4.28 online courses, they were relatively equal in their preference for taking online courses versus face-to-face or blended courses, $\chi^2(2, N=152) = .250, p = .88$. Between 48 and 53 participants endorsed each of the three available options regarding course preference. However, 56.6% ($n = 86$) of respondents would like to have more online courses offered at their university, $\chi^2(2, N=152) = 39.49, p = .00$. Most participants indicated that online courses either were more difficult than ($n = 59, 38.8\%$) or equivalent in difficulty ($n = 54, 35.5\%$) to face-to-face courses, $\chi^2(2, N=152) = 4.28, p = .12$.

The three subject areas that participants indicated could best be taught online were history ($n = 106, 69.7\%$), sociology ($n = 87, 57.2\%$), and computer science ($n = 67, 44.1\%$). The three subject areas that participants indicated could least well be taught online were theoretical mathematics ($n = 94, 61.8\%$), applied mathematics ($n = 89, 58.6\%$), and engineering

($\underline{n} = 81, 53.3\%$). For the 61 participants who provided 106 reasons to explain their preference for online courses, the top themes that were identified based on a tabulation of common keywords concerned; flexibility of scheduling and work completions ($\underline{n} = 48, 45.3\%$), and issues relating to convenience and geographic availability ($\underline{n} = 26, 24.5\%$). For the 75 participants who, coincidentally, also provided 106 reasons to explain their preference for not taking online courses, the top themes that were identified based on a tabulation of common keywords concerned; lack of contact with teachers ($\underline{n} = 39, 36.8\%$), and suggestions of lower course quality and student involvement in the online environment ($\underline{n} = 34, 32.1\%$). Remaining themes in the above tabulations were each recorded 5 times or less. Most participants ($\underline{n} = 106, 69.7\%$) indicated that faculty should be certified to teach online courses. Detailed summaries of responses for the nine-opinion/preference questions are provided in table 2 (see Appendix C).

Although responses to the survey question regarding preferences for online versus face-to-face or blended courses did not appear to indicate meaningful differences based on examination of percentage responses (i.e., 31.6 – 34.9%), further evaluation of this variable was conducted. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine whether differences existed in the number of online courses taken by members of the three preference groups (i.e., prefer taking online courses when available, prefer taking courses in a face-to-face setting, prefer a blended course that combines elements of both). ANOVA results achieved significance, $F(2, 149) = 36.894, p = .000, \eta^2 = .33$. Post hoc analysis using Tukey HSD indicated that participants who preferred taking online courses took significantly more online courses ($\underline{m} = 6.85$) than participants who preferred either face-to-face ($\underline{m} = 2.098$) or blended (\underline{m}

= 3.77) courses. Additionally, participants who preferred blended courses took significantly more online courses than participants who preferred face-to-face courses.

A one-way ANOVA also was conducted to examine whether differences existed in the number of online courses taken based on participant's expressed desire for more online courses. ANOVA results achieved significance, $F(2, 149) = 16.755$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .184$. Post hoc analysis using Tukey HSD indicated that participants who expressed desire that more online courses be offered at their institutions were those who reported having already taken significantly more online courses ($\underline{m} = 5.58$) than participants who did not desire more online offerings ($\underline{m} = 2.4$) or those having no particular opinion in this regard ($\underline{m} = 2.71$).

Discussion

This study explored participant preferences for taking online versus traditional face-to-face courses and sought to determine some reasons for their preferences. Several researchers (Fillion et al., 2009; Harrington & Loffredo, 2010) indicated that most students, when offered a choice, prefer taking courses online rather than in traditional settings. Results of the current study provided mixed results in this regard. Descriptive results for the survey question regarding preference for online courses failed to identify meaningful differences between groups. However, ANOVA results did indicate that participants who preferred taking online courses took the greatest number of online courses followed by participants who preferred blended courses. Additionally, participants who expressed desire that more online courses be offered at their institutions were those who reported having already taken the most online courses. Therefore, students who have already taken a good number of online courses tend to prefer online courses and desire more online offerings from their institutions.

Participants in the current study provided support for the assertions of Bejerano (2008), Jain et al. (2011), and Jenkins (2011) who indicated that online courses were not appropriate for all students or subject areas. When asked to identify subjects that best and least well could be offered online, their responses for these two categories diverged. Bejerano suggested that online courses best tap into low-level cognitive functions, but are less appropriate for courses that require analysis and synthesis of data or the application and demonstration of acquired skills. Consistent with Bejerano's assertions, participants in the current study identified the relatively content static history course and the computer science course (computer dependent and online accessible) as two of their top three choices for courses best offered online. They also selected three highly technical and application oriented courses (i.e., theoretical mathematics, applied mathematics, engineering) as courses least appropriate for the online format.

In contrast to Deal III's (2002) suggestion that online courses might be perceived as less daunting than traditional classes, participants in the current study indicated that online courses were either more difficult or equivalent in difficulty to face-to-face courses. Consistent with assertions of Deal III, Karber (2003), and Koons (2012), participants in the current study indicated that issues related to flexibility and convenience influenced their preference for online courses. Likewise, current participants perpetuated the previous suggestion (Buck, 2001; Federal Trade Commission, 2006) that course quality is in question with the online format. Perhaps because of that suggestion and participants' indication that lack of contact with instructors is a particular disadvantage associated with online instruction, the current participants also suggested that faculty who teach online courses be certified for this instructional task.

Results of this study may be used to surmise that universities should limit their online offerings to those courses where content is relatively static and interactive involvement between students or data management and application are minimized. University leaders would also be advised to poll students enrolled in existing online and blended courses in an effort to determine which additional courses they would most likely be interested in taking prior to developing unnecessary courses.

Several factors limited this study's general application to a broad audience. Participation in the survey was limited to students with enrollment histories at three public institutions in the southeast portion of the United States. As such, results may not reflect the opinions and preferences of college students in other parts of the country. The survey used in the current study collected nominal data that restricted the types of analyses that could be conducted and may have influenced the results obtained. Survey data were collected for only 5 months during the academic spring semester of 2012. A survey period that included both summer and fall semesters as well as the spring semester might have resulted in different results.

Future studies should continue to examine student and faculty perspectives relative to desires for and satisfaction with online course offerings. A larger and more geographically diverse population that encompasses participants taking courses throughout the academic year should be examined in future studies. Because descriptive results proved to be clarified by more advanced statistical analysis, future studies should focus more readily on collection of data (e.g., Likert scales) that may employ these types of analyses in evaluation of research questions.

References

- Adams, J., & DeFleur, M. (2006). The acceptability of online degrees earned as a credential for obtaining employment. *Communication Education, 55*, 32-45.
- Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2006). *Making the grade: Online education in the United States*. Needham, MA: Sloan Consortium.
- Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2007, October). *Online nation: Five years of growth in online learning*. Needham, MA: Sloan Consortium.
- Angiello, R. (2010). Study looks at online learning vs. traditional instruction. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, 20*(14), 18-20.
- Are online classes for you?* (2008). Retrieved May 10, 2012, from Los Angeles Southwest College Web site http://www.lasc.edu/students/classes-areas-of-study/online_classes/Are_online_classes_for_you.html
- Bejerano, A. (2008). Raising the question #1: The genesis and evolution of online degree programs: Who are they for and what have we lost along the way? *Communication Education, 57*, 408-414.
- Brown, R. (2011). *Community college students perform worse online than face-to-face*. Retrieved May 14, 2012, from <http://chronicle.com/article/Community-College-Students/128281/>
- Buck, J. (2001). Assuring quality in distance education. *Higher Education in Europe, 26*, 599-602.
- Coleman, S. (2005). *Why do students like online learning?* Retrieved May 10, 2012 from, <http://www.worldwidelearn.com/education-articles/benefits-of-online-learning.htm>

- Coyner, S., & McCann, P. (2004). Advantages and challenges of teaching in an electronic environment: The accommodate model. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 31, 223-228.
- Curran, C. (2008). Online learning and the university. In W. J. Bramble & S. Panda (Eds.), *Economics of distance and online learning: Theory, practice, and research* (pp. 26-51). New York: Routledge.
- Davis, C. (2011). *Many students still prefer traditional classes*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from http://roundupdaily.com/opinion/article_598da58c-3fcf-11e0-bcaf-00127992bc8b.html
- Deal III, W. (2002). Distance Learning: Teaching technology online. *The Technology Teacher*, 61, 21-26.
- Dykman, C., & Davis, C. (2008). Online education forum: Part two – teaching online versus teaching conventionally. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 19, 157-164.
- Dykman, C., & Davis, C. (2009). Online education forum: Part three – a quality online educational experience. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 19, 281-289.
- Ellis, R., Ginns, P., & Piggott, L. (2009). E-learning in higher education: Some key aspects and their relationship to approaches to study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28, 303-318.
- Farkas, K. (2011). *Online education growing as colleges offer more classes to meet student demand*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from http://blog.cleveland.com/metro/2011/05/online_education_growing_as_co.html
- Federal Trade Commission. (2006, October). *Diploma mills: Degrees of deception*. Retrieved June 1, 2012, from <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/edu/pubs/consumer/alerts/alt149.shtm>

- Fertig, J. (2012). *Critiquing online learning, part two*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from <http://www.nationalreview.com/phi-beta-cons/293694/critiquing-online-learning-part-two-jason-fertig#>
- Fillion, G., Limayem, M., Laferriere, T., & Mantha, R. (2009). Integrating information and communication technologies into higher education: Investigating onsite and online students' points of view. *Open Learning, 24*, 223-240.
- Gallagher-Lepak, S., Reilly, J., & Killion, C. (2009). Nursing student perceptions of community in online learning. *Contemporary Nurse, 32*, 133-146.
- Harrington, R., & Loffredo, D. (2010). MBTI personality type and other factors that relate to preference for online versus face-to-face instruction. *Internet & Higher Education, 13(1)*, 89-95.
- Jain, P., Jain, S. J., & Jain, S. (2011). Interactions among online learners: A quantitative interdisciplinary study. *Education, 131*, 538-544.
- Jenkins, R. (2011). *Why are so many students still failing online?* Retrieved May 10, 2012, from <http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Are-So-Many-Students-Still/127584>
- Jock, M. (2012). *Student problems with online courses*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from, <http://theeastcarolinian.com/?p=3318>
- Karber, D. (2003). Comparisons and contrasts in traditional versus online teaching in management. *Higher Education in Europe, 26*, 533-536.
- Koons, K. (2012). *New study – students prefer online college classes to traditional classes*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from <http://www.collegeclasses.com/study-students-prefer-online-college-to-traditional-classes/>

Kurth, H. (2012). *Study finds first-generation college students prefer 'collaborative learning'*.

Retrieved May 10, 2012, from http://northernstar.info/campus/news/article_0e5e130a-94cc-11e1-a3df-001a4bcf6878.html

Lee, M. (2011). *Culture and distance learning*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from

http://www.ethnoconnect.com/html/articles_22.html

Lyons, J. (2004). Teaching U.S. history online: Problems and prospects. *The History Teacher*, 37, 447-56.

Lytle, R. (2011). *Study: online education continues growth*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from

<http://www.usnews.com/education/online-education/articles/2011/11/11/study-online-education-continues-growth>

Menon, G., & Rubin, M. (2011). A survey of online practitioners: Implications for education and practice. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 29, 133-141.

Muilenberg, L., & Berge, Z. (2005). Student barriers to online learning: A factor analytic study. *Distance Education*, 26, 29-48.

Palloff, R., & Pratt, K. (2001). *Lessons from the cyberspace classroom: The realities of online teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pros and cons of online education. (2011). Retrieved May 10, 2012, from [http://education-](http://education-portal.com/articles/Pros_and_Cons_of_Online_Education.html)

[portal.com/articles/Pros_and_Cons_of_Online_Education.html](http://education-portal.com/articles/Pros_and_Cons_of_Online_Education.html)

Reynold, J. (2012). *Why do students like online learning?* Retrieved May 10, 2012, from

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Why-Do-Students-Like-Online-Learning?&id=7042650>

Should you pursue an online degree? (2007). Retrieved May 14, 2012, from

<http://www.careerbuilder.com/Article/CB-270-Getting-Ahead-Should-You-Pursue-an-Online-Degree/>

Study: college students prefer classes with online learning. (2008). Retrieved May 10, 2012,

from University of Madison-Wisconsin Web site: <http://www.news.wisc.edu/15640>

Taylor, S. (2003). The endless class. *Community College Week*, 15, 6-9.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from Higher Education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research.

Review of Educational Research, 45, 89-125.

Ulmer, L., Watson, L., & Derby, D. (2007). Perceptions of higher education faculty members on

the value of distance education. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8, 59-70.

Waits, T., & Lewis, L. (2003). *Distance education at degree-granting postsecondary*

institutions: 2000-2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National

Center for Education Statistics.

Appendix A

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<hr/>		
Gender		
Male	46	30.3
Female	106	69.7
Geographic Location?		
City	58	38.2
Suburban	28	18.4
Rural	62	40.8
Other	4	2.6
Age		
18-20	39	25.7
21-29	64	42.1
30-39	27	17.8
40-49	14	9.2
50 or older	8	5.3

(Appendix A cont.)

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Employment Status		
Employed, working 1-39 hours per week	58	38.2
Employed, working 40 or more hours per week	36	23.7
Not employed, looking for work	24	15.8
Not employed NOT looking for work	34	22.4
Educational Status		
Full-time graduate student working toward a degree	31	20.4
Part-time graduate student working toward a degree	12	7.9
Part-time graduate student not working toward a degree	3	2.0
Full-time undergraduate student working toward a degree	97	63.8
Part-time undergraduate student working toward a degree	6	3.9
Not enrolled in a course	2	1.3

Appendix B

Survey Questions and Response Options

1. If you prefer taking courses online, please state some of your reasons.
2. If you do not prefer taking courses online, please state some of your reasons.
3. Which subject(s) do you feel can best be taken online?
(Language; Fine Arts; Applied Mathematics; Theoretical Mathematics; Natural Science; Physical Science; Computer Science; Engineering; Foreign Language; Statistics; Business; Primary Education; Secondary Education; Higher Education; Construction; History; Sociology; Music; None; Other please specify).
4. Which subject(s) do you feel can least be taken online?
(Language; Fine Arts; Applied Mathematics; Theoretical Mathematics; Natural Science; Physical Science; Computer Science; Engineering; Foreign Language; Statistics; Business; Primary Education; Secondary Education; Higher Education; Construction; History; Sociology; Music; None; Other please specify).
5. Which best describes your preference:
(taking courses online when available, taking courses in a face-to-face setting, taking a blended course that combines elements of both?)
6. Would you like to have more online courses offered at your institution?
(Yes; No; It does not matter to me).
7. Do you feel that faculty should be certified to teach online courses?
(Yes; No; It does not matter to me).

(Appendix B cont.)

8. What is your opinion of online courses?

(They are easier than face-to-face courses; They are more difficult than face-to-face courses; They are about the same as face-to-face courses).

9. How many online courses have you taken? (1-9; 10 or more, none).

Appendix C

Table 2

Participant Responses to Survey Questions

Question	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Response Options		
If you prefer taking courses online, please state some of your reasons.		
Flexibility of scheduling and work completion	48	45.3
Convenience and geographic availability	26	24.5
Access (less travel, no classes to attend)	18	16.9
Greater interaction with classmate	5	4.7
Depth of content and relaxed atmosphere	4	3.7
Ability to use notes and books on tests	3	2.8
Learning to use and enjoyment of technology	2	1.8
If you do not prefer taking courses online, please state some of your reasons.		
Lack of personal contact with the teacher	39	36.8
Lower course quality and student involvement	34	32.1
Lack of contact with peers	14	13.2
Lack of full class experience	10	9.4
Technology problems	7	6.6
More difficult online tests and activities	2	1.9

(Appendix C cont.)

Question			
	Response Options	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Which subject(s) do you feel can best be taken online?			
	Language	57	37.5
	Fine Arts	41	27.0
	Applied Mathematics	31	20.4
	Theoretical Mathematics	13	8.6
	Natural Science	43	28.3
	Physical Science	43	28.3
	Computer Science	67	44.1
	Engineering	8	5.3
	Foreign Language	32	21.1
	Statistics	31	20.4
	Business	59	38.8
	Primary Education	49	32.2
	Secondary Education	42	27.6
	Higher Education	46	30.3
	Construction	6	3.9
	History	106	69.7
	Sociology	87	57.2
	Music	41	27.0
	None	12	7.9
	Other	11	7.2

(Appendix C cont.)

Question		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Response Options			
Which subject(s) do you feel can least be taken online?			
Language		43	28.3
Fine Arts		37	24.3
Applied Mathematics		89	58.6
Theoretical Mathematics		94	61.8
Natural Science		52	34.2
Physical Science		61	40.1
Computer Science		28	18.4
Engineering		81	53.3
Foreign Language		68	44.7
Statistics		59	38.8
Business		18	11.8
Primary Education		36	23.7
Secondary Education		37	24.3
Higher Education		41	27.0
Construction		64	42.1
History		16	10.5
Sociology		15	9.9
Music		57	37.5
None		5	3.3
Other		2	1.3

(Appendix C cont.)

Question	Response Options	N	%
Which best describes your preference?			
	taking courses online when available	53	34.9
	taking courses in a face-to-face setting	51	33.6
	taking a blended course that combines elements of both	48	31.6
Would you like to have more online courses offered at your institution?			
	Yes	86	56.6
	No	25	33.6
	It does not matter to me	48	31.6
Do you feel that faculty should be certified to teach online courses?			
	Yes	106	69.7
	No	10	6.6
	It does not matter to me	36	23.7
What is your opinion of online courses?			
	They are easier than face to face courses	39	25.7
	They are more difficult than face to face courses	59	38.8
	They are about the same as face-to-face courses	54	35.5

(Appendix C cont.)

Question		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Response Options			
<hr/>			
How many online courses have you taken?			
1		14	9.2
2		17	11.2
3		22	14.5
4		12	7.9
5		16	10.5
6		6	3.9
7		5	3.3
8		5	3.3
9		2	1.3
10 or more		28	18.4
None		25	16.4
